

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-4, 6-14 and 31 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 1-4, 6-14 and 31 were rejected. With this Amendment, no claims were amended, added or cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1-4, 6-14 and 31 remain at issue.

#### **I. Objection To Claims**

Applicants thank the Examiner for the reminder regarding the numbering of the claims, and for renumbering claim 15 to claim 31.

#### **II. 35 U.S.C. § 102 Anticipation Rejection of Claims**

Claims 1-4, 6-10, 12, 14, 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Rose (U.S. Patent No. 5,708,709). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 is directed to a content distribution system for performing content transaction management, where a secure container distributing device among the plurality of user devices is configured to compare sampling information input by a user with the template stored in the IDC identified in reference to the IDC identifier list. As disclosed in the specification, subject template info (*i.e.*, the sampling information and the template) is a field to describe identification information of an user, wherein data representing biometric information such as a fingerprint of the user is stored after being encrypted. See specification at 52, lines 6-9. More specifically, the encryption algorithm used to encrypt the template, the unique identifier (ID) or the certificate number of the public key certificate used in encryption, an encryption algorithm, a parameter, a start date and an expiration date indicating the validity period of the template, the type of the template, and the template (encrypted) are described. See specification at 52, lines 9-15. Rose neither discloses nor suggests this limitation. Accordingly, claim 1, and claims 2-4, 6-10, 12,

and 14 that depend from claim 1 are allowable over Rose. For reasons similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 31 is also allowable over Rose. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

**III. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims**

Claims 11 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rose. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.


As discussed above, Rose does not disclose or suggest a secure container distributing device among the plurality of user devices is configured to compare sampling information input by a user with the template stored in the IDC identified in reference to the IDC identifier list, as required by claim 1. Thus, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to sign the container disclosed by Rose to derive claims 11 and 13. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

**IV. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully request early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 24, 2006

By:   
Marina N. Saito  
Registration No. 42,121  
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP  
P.O. Box 061080  
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080  
(312) 876-8000